

THE GLOBE. HUNTINGDON, PA. Wednesday, August 1, 1860.

REGULARLY NOMINATED DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

FOR PRESIDENT, STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT, HERSHEL V. JOHNSON, OF GEORGIA.

DEMOCRATIC STATE NOMINATIONS, FOR GOVERNOR, HENRY D. FOSTER, OF WESTMORELAND.

To the Democrats of Huntingdon County. The Democratic citizens of the several boroughs and townships of Huntingdon county, are hereby notified to meet at their usual places of holding primary meetings...

We ask every Democrat to read carefully the Resolutions and Address published in to-day's Globe, which were unanimously adopted by the Democratic Mass Meeting assembled at Harrisburg on Thursday last.

The Meeting was respectively large—and a large majority of the Democrats taking an active interest in its proceedings have always been prominent and influential men of the party.

A SPECK OF WAR.—The last Huntingdon Union raised to its mast-head the disorganizers' ticket,—Breckinridge and Lane—and says: "Henceforth, we shall have no olive branch to offer, but shall approach our enemies with the red right hand of war."

Will the Democrats of Huntingdon county be frightened into the support of the disorganizing Disunion ticket? Or will they stand by the nominations made by the regular National Democratic Convention?

As the Union has thrown out a challenge to test the strength in this county of the regular nominees, Douglas and Johnson, and of the Seceders disorganizing candidates, Breckinridge and Lane, we hope the Democrats will accept the challenge and show their devotion to their party, its principles and its regular nominees by electing the right kind of men delegates to the Democratic County Convention which will assemble in this place on Wednesday of first week of Court.

The Democratic voters of the county will also bear in mind when they meet in their several election districts for the purpose of electing delegates to their county convention, that said delegates may be called upon to elect a Representative Delegate to a State Convention, if one should be ordered by the State Executive Committee as requested by the State Mass Meeting, held at Harrisburg on Thursday last.

THE SUMMER OF 1860.—The present summer promises to be memorable for hurricanes, hail storms, hot weather, big crops, astronomical wonders, an unusual influx of Asiatic and European royalty, and a superabundance of Presidential candidates.

THE DEMOCRACY SPEAK!

No Compromise with Disunionists! A Clean Electoral Ticket Demanded! DEMOCRATIC STATE MASS MEETING!

Douglas, Johnson, Foster and Victory! Pursuant to a call issued by R. J. Haldeman, member of the National Democratic Committee, and A. L. Bounford, William D. Boas, Wm. H. Miller, Wm. H. Eckels, John H. Ziegler, Philip Dougherty, and J. M. Kreiter, members of the Democratic State Executive Committee resident at Harrisburg, a Mass Convention of the friends of Douglas, Johnson and Foster, assembled in the Hall of the House of Representatives, at Harrisburg, on Thursday, July 26th, at 2 o'clock, P. M., and was called to order by Mr. Haldeman.

This Convention has been summoned in accordance with a request of the members of the State Committee, resident at Harrisburg, (with one exception) and a member of the National Democratic Committee who chanced to be at that place.

The National Democratic Committee which met at Charleston and adjourned to Baltimore, passed a series of resolutions which only differed from the platform put forth by the Reading Convention in this—That it went out to meet our States brethren in a more determined expression upon Territorial questions than those which the State Convention had unanimously adopted.

When the National Democratic Convention adjourned at Baltimore, it was known that seceders had pre-arranged a plan for the division of the Democratic party in all the States of this Union, under the specious plea of compromise. With this knowledge the National Committee met, in order to prevent, so far as possible, a plan of disorganization which might be fatal to the party.

Resolved. The crisis demanding the organization of the Democratic party against a general as well as secret enemies of the Constitution and the Union, that it is therefore recommended to the several State Committees that they take measures to secure the adoption of the Electoral Ticket in their respective States, pledged to the unequivocal support of the nominees of the Democratic Convention, Stephen A. Douglas and Herschel V. Johnson.

Resolved. That if any State Committee shall meet to take the proper steps for securing such an Electoral Ticket, then the members of the National Committee in that State is hereby authorized to take such action as he may deem necessary for that purpose.

The National Committee felt that in a period of disorganization it was necessary that it should do that which had never been necessary before—exercise its supervisory powers over State organizations. We have either a National organization or not. Having a National organization, it must be organized in some corporate body, to speak for it. Under these circumstances the State Committee assembled. It had been formed at Reading, in accordance with a resolution which authorized the President to choose members from each Senatorial District, and he himself chairman thereof. An additional resolution pledged that all who were members of that Convention should support the regular nominees of the Democratic party made at Reading and to be made at Charleston; and consequently, to be made at the regular Convention at Baltimore.

The Chairman of the State Committee consequently, who was President of the Convention, was the organ through whom the will of the Reading Convention was unanimously conveyed to the State Committee. One assembly in Philadelphia, forty-five members less than the majority of the whole Committee, nearly one half of that forty-five composed of gentlemen from Philadelphia, adopted a series of resolutions which were in direct hostility to the action of the National Democratic Convention at Baltimore and the decision of the National Democratic Committee at Washington. Yet I, as a representative of that Committee, carrying out the spirit which the friends of Mr. Douglas have manifested from the beginning of this war, made still more concessions. As we had yielded to dictation at Charleston, when we were told that men would secede if we did not make a platform before we made a nominee—as we were told, again at Baltimore, that they would secede if we did not yield to every one of their imperious demands, and, as we submissively bowed to them, so I never attempted to use in any manner whatever that power which rightfully belongs to the National Democratic Committee. (Cheers.) I have done nothing but request sound National Democrats to meet in council, and I have done that under cover of the State Committee.

The State organization, the National organization, the National Democracy and the National convention have thus assembled you here, gentlemen, to-day. (Cheers.) It has been said, and even by so high a personage as the President of the United States, that there is no Democratic nominee. If there is no Democratic nominee, why then shall we obey a State Committee appointed by one man? If there are, like Canute, who believe themselves, like Canute, able to declare, "thus far the proud waves shall go and no farther," we will answer that the Democratic party in its National organization is as strong and invincible as the waves which destroyed Canute. (Applause.)

We are meeting for the purpose of saving the Democratic party from disorganization within and without. Men are here of the National delegation to Charleston and Baltimore, National men of the State Central Committee, National delegates to Reading, have all assembled for the purpose of saving the Democratic organization from treason, and we throw back any imputation with all the force that we can, with all the energy derived from truth.

J. T. Owen of Philadelphia, selected as Secretary of the Convention. Mr. Smith on taking the chair made a few appropriate remarks.

A committee on permanent organization was appointed, during the absence of which Hon. Charles Brown of Philadelphia, delivered an able speech, and at its conclusion, the Committee reported the following permanent officers:

- President—HENRICK B. WRIGHT, of Luzerne county. Vice Presidents—Joseph Megarey, John P. Deal, Francis McCormick, and Edmund Keyser, of Philadelphia; John D. Pettit, of Chester; A. T. Duffield, of Bucks; R. E. Wright, of Lehigh; A. G. Green, of Berks; J. Woods Brown, of Northumberland; Benj. G. Crist, of Schuylkill; Gen. John L. Lilly, of Carbon; John Kovler, of Franklin; John J. Means, of Bradford; George P. Steele, of Luzerne; E. A. Kroir, of Potter; Hon. C. D. Eldred, of Lycoming; John K. Clements, of Northumberland; Hon. John J. Reifsnyder, of Perry; Dr. Mercer Brown, of Dauphin; John Black, of Lancaster; H. L. Fisher, of York; B. F. Meyers, of Bradford; J. F. Leonard, of Clearfield; D. Williams, of Indiana; John M. Laird, of Westmoreland; Peter Byrne, of Luzerne; Jacob Zeigler, of Butler; Geo. W. Patton, of Erie; Gen. John Ross, of Mifflin; Wm. R. Gargas, of Cumberland; Charles L. Lambertson, of Clarion; John Busby, of Adams.

Secretaries—J. Simpson Africa, of Huntingdon; J. T. Owen, of Philadelphia; Adam Worthman, of Philadelphia; Stanley Woodward, of Luzerne; John S. Dougherty, of Lancaster; C. T. Alexander, of Centre; John M. Baum, of Union; Robert A. Lambertson, of Dauphin; John A. Meyer, of Perry; Josiah Bonner, of Adams; John G. Orr, of Franklin; J. Addison McCool, of Schuylkill; Major Jon. Ranch, of Northumberland; Wm. A. Jones, of York; Richard Vaux, of Philadelphia, the Chair was authorized to appoint a committee of thirteen to prepare an address and resolutions. The Chair appointed as such committee, Richard Vaux, of Philadelphia; L. C. Mitchell, of Centre; John Cessna, of Bedford; W. L. Dewart, of Northumberland; Charles Brown, of Philadelphia; John W. Maynard, of Lycoming; James Hill, of Franklin; Israel Painter, of Northumberland; Judge Champey, of Lancaster; Stanley Woodward, of Luzerne; George W. Pearce, of Chester; C. L. Ward, of Bradford; Geo. H. Bucher, of Cumberland.

During the absence of the committee, the meeting was ably addressed by several gentlemen. Hon. Richard Vaux from the committee reported the following resolutions, which, with the address, after some discussion, were unanimously adopted amid much applause.

Resolved. We, Democrats from all parts of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in Mass Convention assembled, in favor of the regular organization of the Democratic party, its nominations, usages, and principles, do hereby solemnly declare and resolve— 1st. That we ratify and confirm the resolutions and nominations of the late State Democratic Convention held at Reading.

2d. That we ratify and confirm the resolutions and nominations adopted and made by the only regularly organized Democratic National Convention held at Charleston and Baltimore. 3d. That we hereby proclaim our sincere, faithful, energetic, and uncompromising support of the nominations by the State Convention of Henry D. Foster for Governor, and by the National Democratic Convention of Hon. Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois, for President, and Hon. Herschel V. Johnson, of Georgia, for Vice President of the United States.

4th. That we hereby solemnly protest against the proceedings of the Democratic State Committee, held at Philadelphia on the 23d of July, 1860— 1st. Because said action of that committee was unwarranted by the terms and authority of its appointment. 2d. That it was in opposition to the instructions and resolutions of the Reading Convention, from which it alone derived its official authority.

3d. That it thereby proposed to release the electors from the only duty enjoined on them to vote for the regular candidates nominated by the regularly constituted National Convention of the Democracy of the United States, and undertook to authorize and justify said electors to vote for candidates other than those so regularly nominated. 4th. That said action of State Committee is contrary to the usages of the party, tends to break up its organization, recognizes direct opposition to its nominees, and would prevent the masses of the party from voting for Stephen A. Douglas and Herschel V. Johnson, the Democratic nominees for President and Vice President of the United States.

Resolved. That the action proposed by the disorganizing committee of the State Committee, and endeavoring to possess and control its organization. Our primary duty, then, is to examine the grounds upon which these remarkable arrogations are founded, and to ascertain what reason there is in these bold assumptions. If they are really the Democratic party—if their candidates are the National Democratic nominees—it is clearly and manifestly our duty as loyal Democrats to support them and no others. Otherwise they are entitled to no more respect or consideration from us than any other opposing and anti-Democratic organization.

We have either but one Democratic nominee for President and one for Vice President, or we have none, because there was but one National Democratic Convention called and invested with power to make nominations, to which we, in any manner, owe our political allegiance. That Convention was duly called, and in accordance therewith, met in the city of Charleston on the 23d day of April last, and then it adopted as its platform of principle, with some slight additions in which all concurred, the series of resolutions adopted at Cincinnati in 1856, advocated during the Presidential campaign of that year by Democrats throughout the entire Union, and maintained triumphantly at the ballot-box by the American people. Upon the occurrence of this result a number of the delegates from the entire States, under the lead of Wm. L. Yancey, who avails himself not for the Union, claiming the recognition of a doctrine inconsistent with all the past professions of the Democratic party, severed their connection with the Convention and with the party, retired to another portion of the city, and formed themselves into a separate and distinct body—distinct, not only in organization, but distinct

and diverse in their fundamental principles. After this disintegration of the Convention, that body proceeded to ballot for a candidate for President of the United States, and so continued for fifty-seven consecutive ballots, during which Stephen A. Douglas received a decided majority of all the votes of a full Convention. The minority should then have yielded; but having due regard for the usages of the party, and desiring as far as consistent with honor to conciliate and satisfy the extreme South, the Convention, after authorizing the Democracy of the States, whose delegates had resigned their commissions and abandoned their seats, to supply the vacancies thus occasioned, adjourned to meet in Baltimore on the 18th day of June. Pursuant to said adjournment, the Convention re-assembled, and by virtue of the power inherent in all deliberative bodies, it proceeded to determine, in the usual manner, who of the different claimants were entitled to take seats and act as delegates in the Democratic National Convention. This question being decided (as all questions necessarily are) contrary to the will and wishes of the minority, an additional secession occurred. The State of the Convention after all secessions, and the manner in which our candidate was nominated, is succinctly stated by the National Democratic Committee, as follows:

After all secessions, as well as the refusal of certain delegates from Georgia and Arkansas, together with the entire delegations from Texas and Mississippi, to occupy their seats our National Convention at Baltimore yet retained 424 delegates, or 212 electoral votes; being ten more than two-thirds of the electoral votes of the whole Union. But some of these delegates (as in the case of Georgia) refrained from voting, the majority of the delegation having retired; others (as in the case of Arkansas,) although full delegations, and authorized, in case of any secession, to cast the whole vote of their State, preferred only to cast that which would be a fair proportion between the Seceders and themselves; and yet others (as in the case of Delaware and portions of the delegations from Kentucky and Missouri) declined to vote, but refused to secede. This accounts for the fact that, upon the second ballot by States, Mr. Douglas received only 181 1/2 votes. Mr. Breckinridge receiving 105, Mr. Guthrie 4 votes, the States of South Carolina (8) and Florida (3) having authorized no delegates to any convention at Baltimore. Here is the ballot as recorded:

Breckinridge. Guthrie. Douglas. Maine, " 7 New Hampshire, " 5 Vermont, " 5 Massachusetts, " 10 Rhode Island, " 4 Connecticut, " 3 New York, " 25 New Jersey, " 23 Pennsylvania, 10 2 1/2 Maryland, " 10 Virginia, " 3 North Carolina, " 1 Alabama, " 9 Louisiana, " 6 Arkansas, " 1 1/2 Missouri, " 4 Tennessee, " 3 Kentucky, " 2 Indiana, " 13 Illinois, " 11 Michigan, " 6 Wisconsin, " 5 Iowa, " 4 Minnesota, " 4

On motion of Mr. Clark of Missouri, at the instance of Mr. Hogg, of Virginia, the question was then propounded from the chair whether the nomination of Douglas should or should not be, without further ceremony, the unanimous act of the Convention and of all delegates present, the chairman distinctly requesting that any delegate who objected (whether or not having voted) should signify his dissent. No delegate dissented; and thus, at last, was Stephen A. Douglas unanimously nominated in a Convention representing more than two-thirds of all the electoral votes as the candidate of the Democratic party for the Presidency of the United States.

It may further be added, that so far as the Democratic party of Pennsylvania are concerned, they are honorably bound by the action of their entire delegation to support Stephen A. Douglas and Herschel V. Johnson, because as it appears from the recorded proceedings of the Convention, every delegate from this State was present, and consenting to the passage of the resolution declaring Mr. Douglas to be the unanimous nominee of the Democratic party. No one of our delegation notified the Convention of their withdrawal therefrom, or of a suspension of his participation in its deliberations. While a number declined to vote and actually associated with the Seceders, our entire delegation appears, from the records, to have been present when the final resolution was passed without a dissenting voice. Mr. Dawson, who had been a consistent opponent of Douglas for the nomination, with a promptness that did him great credit as chairman of the delegation, pledged the Democracy of the Keystone State to the support of the nominees of that Convention. Under these circumstances, then, Pennsylvania should be the last State in which secession will be permitted to set its feet.

When the Democratic Convention adjourned at Charleston, the Seceders adjourned, not to meet in conjunction with their late associates, but to meet at Richmond on the 11th day of June. They accordingly did then and there re-assemble, but the Baltimore Seceders refused to join them, and, without authority, without call or announcement, came together in an impromptu manner, and after playing the farce of christening themselves the National Democratic party, agreed unanimously that John C. Breckinridge and Joseph Lane should be their candidates for President and Vice President. The whole number of votes, reported by themselves to have been cast for their candidates, being but one hundred and five, it is apparent that at no time had they a quorum of a National Democratic Convention, and at no time were they competent, (conceding their regularity in all other respects) even to organize such a Convention, much less to perform acts binding upon the Democracy. The utmost they can claim for their proceedings is that they were the originators and incompetency of a new party, distinct and separate in every respect from all other political organizations known to the American people.

To revert to the proceedings of the National Convention, let us inquire in what particular were they irregular? Or what occurred which was not made in strict accordance with the usages of the party, and is not therefore binding upon the Democracy? The chief complaint made by the Seceders was that persons were improperly admitted to seats as delegates.

Now, without inquiring into the merits of the respective delegations contesting—which question was fairly settled by the Convention—we have simply to ascertain whether the Convention transcended its powers or not, in assuming absolute and final jurisdiction thereof. This can scarcely be alleged, for the Seceders themselves, without disputing the complete jurisdiction of the convention over the question, participated throughout in the very proceedings which resulted in the contingency upon the happening of which they withdrew. Similar questions had been determined in the same way at Charleston without objection, complaint or secession on that account. It is not known that in the entire history of the party any other manner of settling contested seats has ever been resorted to. The rules of the House of Representatives of the United States were adopted, so far as applicable, for the government of the convention. Section V, Art. 1, of the Constitution of the United States, (which is necessarily one of the rules of the House,) says: "Each house shall be the judge of the election, returns and qualifications of its own members." Then the convention had full power to pass finally upon the credentials of persons claiming to participate as delegates, and every acting delegate was obliged in honor to abide by the decision of the majority upon that as upon all other questions. Again, it is said that Mr. Douglas was not fairly nominated, because he did not receive the votes of two-thirds of a full Convention. The fallacy of this assumption has already been made apparent by a quotation from the National Committee, but it may be remarked that until the present bold attempt to distract and destroy the Democratic party, the rule was never held to require more than two-thirds of the votes cast for a candidate, provided the votes so cast were a quorum. The convention at which it was first adopted (in 1844) thus construed it, and a similar construction has uniformly been placed upon it, by common consent, in every convention from that day to this, except the one over which Caleb Cushing unfortunately presided. Mr. Douglas on the second ballot at Baltimore received all the votes cast but fourteen, and on the final vote declaring him the unanimous nominee more than two-thirds of a full convention gave their assent. So that under either construction of the rule, he is the regular nominee of the National Democratic Convention, according to the usages of the party, and, therefore, the nominee of the entire party. Those who do not support him are outside the party, and it matters not to us where they belong. If they are not for us they are against us.

THE COMPROMISE. The action of the State Executive Committee in recommending a compromise and a Union electoral ticket, is already so well known to the people as to render it unnecessary that the resolutions, so insidiously framed and dangerous in their character, should be inserted here. They simply propose that in a certain contingency, the electors appointed by the State Convention at Reading shall vote (in the event of their election, for Breckinridge and Lane—gentlemen unknown as Democratic candidates. They argue most earnestly, and with apparent sincerity, the propriety of consenting to this arrangement, because it will combine the entire strength of the Democratic party in the State, and secure the election of the ticket. Could we believe that any action of those who manage the machinery of politics would bind the incorruptible masses of the Democracy, and lead them like dumb men, whithersoever we would, and had we no more worthy object, no more elevated aim, than mere temporary success and the election of our candidates, we might be induced to consent to this unauthorized, unworthy, and disorganizing suggestion of the Executive Committee.

What are the elements with which we are asked to unite? The seceding organization is composed of the ultra Disunionists and slave-cold advocates of the South, and the cohorts of the Federal Administration, animated by a spirit of vindictive personal hostility—such as animated Themistocles in his constant warfare upon the immortal Aristides—bent on the defeat of our candidate, although it may result in the destruction of the Democratic party and the dissolution of the American Union. It is composed of men who withdrew from a regularly called, regular organized, and regularly acting Democratic Convention, and set up for themselves outside of that body and in opposition to it. Their doctrine, like that of the Republican seceders, is the power of Congress over the Territories for their government, and demands that that power shall be exercised for protection of slavery therein—a doctrine which is in direct contravention of all the past professions of the Democracy, and in contradiction of the principles advocated North and South by every Democratic orator four years ago, including John C. Breckinridge, the nominee of the Seceders, and Gen. Buchanan, the President of the United States.

The secession at Charleston occurred, ostensibly, on account of the refusal of the Convention to adopt the very platform which our Executive Committee propose that the Democracy of Pennsylvania shall now support. A union upon an electoral ticket pledged to the support of both candidates would be an amalgamation of principles as antagonistic as the poles. How could we conduct the campaign as the upholders of conflicting theories of government? What principles would our press advocate? What would our public speakers say? What addresses would our committees issue? We denounced the Republican and American parties, in the last Presidential contest, for their sacrifice of principle in forming a combination, and now we are asked to render ourselves obnoxious to similar and more scathing denunciations! The fact has already been adverted to, that a controlling influence in the new party is a personal malignity against our candidate. Can we trust men thus actuated to support him under any circumstances? If we can, then, verily, may we rejoice in the dawning of the millennium, when enemies can in union dwell—when "the wolf and the lamb shall lie down together."

Moreover, the course pursued by the new organization since the adjournment at Baltimore, shows conclusively that they have "no party nor lot with us," and we should not have with them—that they are real enemies of Democracy, and that their professed desire for harmony is but the disguise of some ulterior and dangerous purpose. It has been aptly compared to the wooden horse, which, filled with armed men, ready to rush forth from their seclusion and annihilate its observers and their enemies, once used by the Greeks to attract and deceive the Trojans.— They have persistently continued the business of separating themselves from the organization, have nominated a full State ticket in many of the States of the Union, and in some of the counties of this State have actually se-